

REMARKS

Claims 2-10 and 12 are pending in the application.

Based on the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and withdraw them.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

On page 2 of the Office Action, claims 2-10 and 12 were rejected under section 103(a). This rejection is respectfully traversed as being based on a combination of references that does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

As recited in amended claim 1, the present invention is directed to a telescopable boring rod mechanism with at least two mutually displaceable Kelly rods adjacent to each other, which are equipped with means for transmitting a torque to the adjacent Kelly rod. At least one of the Kelly rods is constructed from at least two rod segments, which are made from a different material, wherein one rod segment is made from a steel material and the other rod segment is made from a lightweight construction material. The rod segment made from the lightweight construction material is firmly connected to the rod segment made from the steel material and has a sufficient torsional stiffness for permitting torque transmission.

As pointed out by the Examiner in the Office Action, Petersen et al. includes a telescopic joint 24'. This telescopic joint 24' is provided at the upper end of the conductor pipe 24 to compensate for up-and-down movement of the vessel (column 3, lines 60-63). However, because the telescopic joint 24' is provided *at the upper end* of the conductor pipe 24, the ability of the

conductor pipe 24 to be telescopic and displaceable is relative to the drill rig only. The remaining individual pipe sections 29 have a plug-type connection, and thus are not mutually displaceable with respect to each other. Further, the conductor pipe 24 houses, but is not itself, a boring mechanism. Thus, Petersen et al. does not teach or suggest a telescopable boring rod mechanism as required by the claims.

It is noted that the Office Action does not cite any portion of either Petersen et al. or Kopecki et al. as teaching the torque transmitting feature of the invention.

In fact, Petersen et al.'s rod segments are not used for transmitting a torque. As stated by Petersen et al. at column 1, line 57 - column 2, line 8, Petersen et al. states (emphasis added):

Deepwater wells are generally drilled by one of two methods... In the second method, a large-diameter pipe known as a marine conductor pipe is put together and arranged to extend from the drilling wellhead assembly on the ocean floor to the barge on the surface of the water. *In the latter [i.e., the second] method, the drill pipe rotates within the conductor pipe with the drilling fluid being circulated down through the drill pipe, through the bit at the bottom thereof, up the outside of the drill pipe and thence upwardly through the annular space between the conductor pipe and the drill pipe, returning to the barge in the conventional way. The present invention is concerned with apparatus to be used in the second method described hereinabove.*

As further stated at column 3, lines 72-75, and consistent with the description at column 1, line 57 - column 2, line 8, Petersen et al.'s "[m]arine conductor pipe 24 is comprised of a series of elongated pipe segments 29 which are connected in an end-to-end manner to provide a drilling

passage for a drill string”; that is, the pipe segments 29 form a sleeve surrounding the drill string. In other words, in Petersen et al.’s device, it is the drill string that transmits rotary motion. The conductor pipe 24 (and the pipe segments 29 forming the pipe 24) is not used to transmit rotary motion to the drill string.

Further, the structure of Petersen et al.’s conductor pipe 24 would prevent it from being used for transmitting torque. The screw connection 48, 33 could not transfer significant torque, because element 33 is not a hole, but a circular groove. Also, the clamping mechanism 35, 36 between the conduit member 30 and the flange 32 appears to be unsuited for transmitting significant torque.

Kopecki et al. was cited only for its teaching of the interchangeability of glass fibers and carbon fibers in composite drillpipes. However, Kopecki et al. relates to drillpipe structures, and drill collars in particular, rather than Kelly rods; and also teaches the interchangeability of glass fibers and carbon fibers, not carbon fibre-reinforced plastic as recited in claim 2.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the invention as recited in claims 2-10 and 12 is patentable over Petersen et al. in view of Kopecki et al., and that the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

All rejections have been properly traversed or rendered moot. Thus, it now appears that the application is in condition for allowance. Should any questions arise, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned representative so that this case may receive an early Notice of Allowance.

Favorable consideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

JACOBSON HOLMAN PLLC

Date: June 7, 2006

By: 

Customer No. 00,136
400 Seventh Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
(202) 638-6666

Allen S. Melser
Registration No. 27,215